

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The specification stands objected to for the reasons that it is not clear whether the text below the "Description of the Preferred Embodiment" is intended to be included in the specification, and the phrase "somewhat schematic" in line 1 of paragraph [0014] is unclear. These objections are thought overcome by the deletion of the text following "The Description of the Preferred Embodiment" and by deleting "somewhat" from the phrase "somewhat schematic".

Claim 1 is pending in this application.

Claim 1 stands objected to by the Examiner due to line 3 containing the phrase "said ground wheel", which the Examiner desires be changed to --said at least one ground wheel--

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the prior art, defined in the claim preceding the "improvement" section, in view of Gronau et al. (6,312,066). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection is in error.

Initially, it is noted that claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the substance of claims 2-4. Claim 1 requires a **towed agricultural** implement having a braking system including a braking application force control system for controlling the application force applied to a brake of at least one ground wheel, The application force control system is placed in a first condition for establishing a predetermined first braking force when an implement condition sensor indicates that the towed implement is being operated on-road, and in a second condition for establishing a second braking force less than said first braking force when the implement condition sensor indicates that the towed implement is being operated off-road.

Gronau et al. disclose a vehicle equipped with an anti-lock braking system including a special control mode which **prevents the reduction of braking** pressure in response to either sensing an off-road condition or by manually signally an off-road condition (column 1 lines 65-67, and column 2, lines 1-13).

Thus, Gronau et al. does not teach lowering the braking force when an off-road condition exists as is set forth in applicants' claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is thought to define patentably over the combination of applicants' admitted prior art and Gronau et al.

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.

Respectfully,



Attorney for Applicant(s)

Jimmie R. Oaks
Reg. No. 24,987
Patent Department
Deere & Company
One John Deere Place
Moline, IL 61265
Telephone No. (309) 765-4392

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an
envelope addressed to
Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on: 28 March 2005
Date



Deere & Company
Signature Date